

**Attendance of the April 16, 2003 GMAC Meeting
(based on sign-in sheet)**

Name	Agency
Brown, Hon. Arthur C.	City of Buena Park
Caldwell, Don	Union Pacific Railroad
Calix, Robert	LACMTA
Carpenter, Jeff	City of Los Angeles Community Redevelopment Agency
Cartwright, Kerry	Port of Long Beach
Catz, Sarah	Golden State Gateway Coalition
Cheng, Luke	LACMTA
Daniels, Hon. Gene	City of Paramount
Dorland, Kanya	Port of Los Angeles
Escoula, Liberty	Caltrans District 7
Fetty, George	George Fetty and Associates
Goodwin, Arthur	ACTA
Green, Gary	Caltrans District 8
Guss, Ron	Intermodal West / CA Trucking Assoc.
Kumar, Vin	Caltrans District 7
Lai, Sue	Port of Los Angeles
Lee, Francis	Caltrans Corridor Studies
Lopez, Ernest	SCAQMD
Marquez, Luis	Urban Dimensions
Neely, Sharon	ACE Construction Authority
Randolph, Stan	Caltrans
Smith, Steve	SANBAG
West, Dale	WRCOG
Zeigler, John	Automobile of Southern California

SCAG Staff

Griffin, Mark
Havens, Alan
Nam, Annie
Wong, Philbert

**GOODS MOVEMENT ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES
WEDNESDAY, APRIL 16, 2003**

1.0 CALL TO ORDER

Councilmember Art Brown, City of Buena Park, called the meeting to order. A list of those in attendance is included in the minutes.

2.0 PUBLIC COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments.

3.0 CONSENT CALENDAR

Approval Items

3.1.1 Approval of the March 19, 2003 Minutes

ACTION: Motion to approve the minutes was accepted and seconded with no objections.

4.0 INFORMATION ITEMS

4.1 Conference report: "Beyond Crisis Response: The New Generation of Transportation Financing in California".

Ms. Sarah Catz, Nossaman, Guthner, Knox, & Elliott, presented this item. Sarah Catz directs a new center at UC Irvine called the Center For Urban Infrastructure. The center covers areas in transportation, housing, land use and water. Given the current budget environment the intention is to examine every possible solution to creating steady revenue streams for infrastructure projects.

Experts in the field of transportation financing were gathered to create a dialog to look at potential revenue streams. It was hoped that a state wide action plan could be created to bring to Sacramento and possibly to Washington D.C. if need be. The conference was held on March 7, 2003 in Costa Mesa, with over 250 participants. One particularly important break out group, important to GMAC dealt with Mega-Projects. Some of the needs reported by members includes; the need for support for

California State Legislation re-authorizing public/private partnership projects, planning and designing capital projects to be consistent with and facilitate operational reforms, developing and strengthening the financing tools available for capital projects, equity participation by investors worldwide, tax exempt financing, tax credit bonds, container fees to replenish the treasury for Class 1 rail investments and other projects, and seeking funding based on the homeland security tie in. The hope is to take the list to Sacramento and at the very least get legislation that would allow regional authorities, JPA's, and other entities to have the authority to develop their own toll projects without going to the legislature for approval.

4.2 Update on the I-710 Corridor Study (cancelled due to conflicting meeting-handout given)

4.3 PILUT RTP Process Update

This item was presented by Philip Law, SCAG staff. PILUT (Planning for Integrated Land Use and Transportation) is a process and a strategy for staff to produce some of SCAG's major planning products in an integrated and collaborative manner in the face of limited budgetary resources. The objectives of PILUT are efficiency and effectiveness. PILUT recognizes that the major planning efforts at SCAG are integrated and mutually supportive and based on an ongoing outreach process.

Currently finalization of growth projections are being done as with the preparation of an initial RTP EIR alternatives. This will continue through the summer and culminate in the fall with the release of the Draft RTP and EIR for public review and comment. The ultimate adoption date for the final RTP and EIR is April 2004 and the adoption must be done by this date for conformity purposes. The goal of the evaluation is to select a single growth projection that will be part of the basis for the RTP alternatives development. The growth projections will be brought to the CEHD at their May 1st meeting.

In addition to the single selected growth projection there will be two scenarios called PILUT 1 and PILUT 2. PILUT 1 and 2 have been developed by SCAG's COMPASS Growth Visioning consultants. The consultants allow the RTP to consider how different types of land use and growth types can help improve the transportation system. Policy scenario 1 focuses future growth of the region in existing urbanized areas while PILUT 2 focuses future growth in out-lying areas. The RTP EIR alternative development will proceed based on these three growth projections using input from the committees and task forces such as GMAC, the county transportation commissions as well as Caltrans, sub-

regions, and other agencies. There will be preliminary transportation modeling conducted to analyze the growth scenarios and conduct public outreach as part of the effort.

Based on the growth projections initial RTP EIR alternatives will be developed. Based on the selected growth projection there is the required CEQA-no project RTP base line alternative. Also included is a modified updated 2001 RTP. From PILUT scenarios 1 and 2 there are two centralized and decentralized alternatives. Each of the alternatives consists of a unique package of transportation investments and policies as well as growth policies and a growth projection. These initial alternatives will undergo refinement and analysis including transportation modeling, refinement of the growth projections, public outreach and the screening of unreasonable alternatives.

Out of that initial analysis the hope is to agree on a final set of alternatives sometime in June. This final set of alternatives will undergo a final analysis of performance measures including land use, environmental, and economic factors, equity and environmental justice along with continuing outreach. Out of the final analysis will come a preferred alternative and the draft RTP and EIR is scheduled to be released this fall. The draft will undergo public review and comment period culminating in the adoption of the final RTP next April.

4.4 Update on Goods Movement Project Lists

Mark Griffin, SCAG, presented this item. The list presented was concurred on by the committee at the March meeting. The goal of the list was to relate the projects that are on the Goods Movement project list and find a 1 to 1 relationship with the projects that are in the working RTP groups list of base line Tier 2 and candidate. The RTP/RTIP ID relates to the base line projects in the RTP project list. Presently there are no Tier 2 projects in the Goods Movement list. The 2004 RTP ID relates roughly to the candidate project list of the RTP. The fields create a pivot table that allow the link between the Goods Movement projects and track where they are occurring and what their status is in the RTP overall project lists that are developing. The list is sorted by county and sponsoring agencies are identified. Those members of the committee with interest in projects that are active in GMAC are encouraged to confirm the projects that were submitted and make sure they are included in the list and see where they presently appear in the RTP lists. If it is not consistent this needs to be raised to the appropriate committees or letters to staff. This will form a foundation for policy discussions which will start in May on some aspects of the Goods Movement program.

Looking at the GMAC project list the GMP ID number is a unique identifier for tracking. The first number represents one of the modes that is used as a primary layer for the Goods Movement program that would be either highway, rail, airport, or marine port. Within each mode 3 types of projects have been identified, either a terminal which is a point feature, or link which would be a linear feature. Presently it is sorted by county but the ultimate sort would be by mode which would present more of a graph or map orientation of the list. This would ultimately allow a visually representation of the list.

At the May meeting there will be discussions of the truck and rail ideas and the policy implications that they imply. Also the funding strategies can be revisited that were in the RTP and see if those need to be modified and how that would shift relative priorities. With the funding amounts that are presented on the list there will be a way to identify what is base line, what is committed or funded and how much is out there that is candidate level projects that are looking for sources of funds. The committee is encouraged to come up with a prioritizing method.

5.0 COMMENT PERIOD

There were no public comments.

6.0 NEXT MEETING

The next regular GMAC meeting will be:
Wednesday, May 21, 2003
9:30am-11:00am
SCAG Offices, San Bernardino Conference Rooms A&B

7.0 ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:00am.